REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6, 8, 12 and 19-22 are amended. Claims 1-22 are pending.

I.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraph 3, claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0019848 to Sugawara et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed because Sugawara does not discuss or suggest:

> a post-processing operation adding unit to add an e-mail post-processing operation to the e-mail to be sent;
>
> a mail receiving unit to receive an e-mail from the e-mail server; and
>
> a post-processing operation implementing unit to check whether there is an email post-processing operation designated in the received e-mail and to implement the post-processing operation to perform post-processing of the e-mail as designated,

as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Sugawara discusses an Internet fax apparatus that allows for a user to be notified of details of a message disposition notification situation (MDN) of a transmission image. When e-mail data is sent, an MDN for the e-mail to be sent is requested and communication management information of the sent e-mail is updated on the basis of a reception result of reply e-mail responsive to the MDN request. The message disposition notification status or delivery status notification of the transmitted e-mail is stored in information 2-11. Transmission information that is managed on the basis of a reception result of a reply e-mail responsive to a sent e-mail is updated.

Sugawara does not discuss or suggest that a post-processing operation that is added to the e-mail is an e-mail post-processing operation. In Sugawara, a message disposition notification is added to an e-mail, and then a reception result of a reply e-mail responsive to the message disposition notification is provided. The message disposition notification is added only so that the sender is able to receive a reception result of the reply e-mail responsive to the sent e-mail. However, the message disposition notification is not an e-mail post-processing operation and does not provide for post-processing of the e-mail.

Further, Sugawara does not discuss or suggest the use of a post-processing operation implementing unit to check whether there is an email post-processing operation designated in the received e-mail and to implement the post-processing operation <u>to perform post-processing of the e-mail</u> as designated. The message disposition notification that is added to the sent e-mail is not an operation that allows for post-processing <u>of the e-mail</u> itself. The message disposition notification results in the sender receiving a reception result of a reply e-mail responsive to the sent e-mail including the message disposition notification.

In contrast, in the present invention of claim 1, for example, the post-processing operation may allow the sender to delete the sent e-mail. Thus, the post-processing operation is <u>of the e-mail</u> and is not a general post-processing operation. The response to the message disposition notification is not a post-processing operation <u>of the e-mail</u> that was sent.

Therefore, as Sugawara does not discuss or suggest "a post-processing operation adding unit to add an e-mail post-processing operation to the e-mail to be sent; a mail receiving unit to receive an e-mail from the e-mail server; and a post-processing operation implementing unit to check whether there is an email post-processing operation designated in the received e-mail and to implement the post-processing operation to perform post-processing of the e-mail as designated," as recited in amended independent claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, Sugawara does not discuss or suggest "selecting an e-mail post-processing operation to perform post-processing of the e-mail to be sent; inputting information needed for the selected post-processing operation <u>to perform post-processing of the e-mail</u>," as recited in amended independent claim 6, claim 6 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Also, Sugawara does not discuss or suggest "checking whether there is an e-mail post-processing operation designated in the received e-mail via an e-mail facsimile machine connected to the e-mail server; memorizing the e-mail post-processing operation; printing out contents of the e-mail; and implementing the memorized post-processing operation <u>to perform post-processing of the e-mail</u>," as recited in amended independent claim 8, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, Sugawara does not discuss or suggest "a mail sending unit to scan a document to convert the document to an e-mail and to allow addition of a specific e-mail post-

processing operation to the e-mail to be sent by a sender; and a mail receiving unit that receives e-mails received by the e-mail server to print out the contents of the e-mail and perform the e-mail post-processing operation <u>to perform post-processing of the e-mail</u>," as recited in amended independent claim 12, claim 12 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Sugawara further does not discuss or suggest "selecting an e-mail post-processing operation of an e-mail to be sent; recording a command in response to the selection of the e-mail post-processing operation on a non-standard header of the e-mail; scanning a document; incorporating the command, the scanned document, and the non-standard header; sending the e-mail to an e-mail server; setting a post-processing flag and storing the post-processing information via a post processing operation implementing unit; and implementing the e-mail post-processing operation <u>to perform post-processing of the e-mail</u> by checking the post-processing flag," as recited in amended independent claim 19, claim 19 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Sugawara also does not discuss or suggest "determining whether an e-mail post processing operation exists in a received e-mail by checking a non-standard header of an e-mail; setting a post-processing flag and storing the post-processing information; and implementing the e-mail post-processing operation <u>to perform post-processing of the e-mail</u> by checking the post-processing flag," as recited in amended independent claim 20, claim 20 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, Sugawara also does not discuss or suggest "a post-processing operation implementing portion to determine <u>whether an e-mail post processing operation to perform post-processing of a received e-mail</u> is recorded on a non-standard header of the received e-mail; and a printing portion to print out contents of the e-mail received," as recited in amended independent claim 21, claim 21 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, Sugawara also does not discuss or suggest "a post-processing operation adding portion to add a specific e-mail post-processing operation <u>in order to perform post-processing of an e-mail to the e-mail to be sent</u>; and a scanning portion to read a document to be sent and to create an image data," as recited in amended independent claim 22, claim 22

patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 7, 9-11 and 13-18 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 6, 8 and 12 and include all the features of their respective independent claims, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. For example, claim 2 recites that "the post-processing operation adding unit uses a non-standard header to add the post-processing operation to the e-mail to be sent." Therefore, claims 2-5, 7, 9-11 and 13-18 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 6, 8, 12 and 19-22 have been amended. Claims 1-22 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: __April 23, 2008__   By: _____

Kari P. Footland
Registration No. 55,187

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501